R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 018 816 CG 001 411

THE EXPERIENCED TEACHER FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM, 1966-67.

BY- CROCKETT, WALTER H. AND OTHERS

CONSORTIUM OF PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

PUB DATE OCT 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$2.12 51P.

DESCRIPTORS- *PROGRAM EVALUATION, *TEACHER EDUCATION, *FELLOWSHIPS, *TEACHER EXPERIENCE, GRADUATE STUDY,

THE MAJOR OBJECTIVE OF THE EXPERIENCED-TEACHER FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM IS TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN AMERICAN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS--(1) BY ASSISTING SELECTED, POTENTIALLY INFLUENTIAL TEACHERS TO PURSUE FULL-TIME GRADUATE EDUCATION IN SPECIALLY PLANNED COURSES OF STUDY, AND (2) BY FOSTERING AND STRENGTHENING AN INCREASED CONCERN FOR THE TRAINING OF TEACHERS. THE OBJECTIVE OF THIS REPORT IS TO DESCRIBE IN DETAIL A PRELIMINARY STUDY OF THE FIRST YEAR OF THE PROGRAM. ALL INFORMATION IS BASED ON--(1) REPORTS BY TEAMS OF EXPERIENCED EVALUATORS WHO VISITED 31 OF THE 50 PROGRAMS, AND (2) RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES ADMINISTERED TO THOSE INVOLVED IN THE PROGRAM (TEACHER-STUDENTS, FACULTY MEMBERS, AND DIRECTORS). THE REPORT CONCLUDES THAT--(1) REACTION TO THE PROGRAM WAS OVERWHELMINGLY FAVORABLE, (2) THERE WAS A HIGH DEGREE OF SOLIDARITY AND MORALE AMONG FELLOWS, (3) THE AMOUNT OF WORK WAS HEAVY AND INVERSELY RELATED TO EFFECTIVENESS AND SATISFACTION, (4) THERE WAS DISAGREEMENT ABOUT HOW WELL THE PROGRAMS BUILT UPON THE EXTENSIVE BACKGROUNDS OF THE FELLOWS AND ABOUT THE EXTENT OF COOPERATION AND INNOVATION IN THE PROGRAMS, AND (5) THE ROLE OF THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT IN DETERMINING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF INDIVIDUAL PROGRAMS. (RD)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED018816

REPORT ON

The Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, 1966-67

By

Walter H. Crockett
Department of Psychology
Clark University
Worcester, Massachusetts

Joseph C. Bentley
Department of Educational Psychology
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah

and

James D. Laird
Department of Psychology
Clark University
Worcester, Massachusetts

1967

CG 001 411

Preface

This report is based on a study conducted by the Consortium of Professional Associations for the Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs (CONPASS) for the U.S. Office of Education.

The Consortium was formed in May, 1966, by the American Historical Association, the Association of American Geographers, the Department of Audiovisual Instruction (NEA), the International Reading Association, and the Modern Language Association of America. Invitations were later extended to, and accepted by, the American Economic Association, the American Industrial Arts Association, and the American Political Science Association. Four members at large provide liaison with the arts and humanities, psychological tests and measurement, educational psychology, and teacher education specialists.

The objectives of CONPASS are to provide a coordinated assessment of the effectiveness and impacts of institutes and other special teacher-training programs; to propose means of improving such programs; and to provide a medium for dialogue among the professional associations and leading scholars of the several subject content disciplines and fields represented on its Board. In the past, the Consortium has conducted studies of summer institutes in individual disciplines; it is presently sponsoring an extensive study of the impact of summer institutes in four disciplines upon participants in the institutes.

The present study of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program was contracted by CONPASS to Clark University, to be conducted under the supervision of the Consortium Board. The research was initiated by Professors Crockett and Bentley, Professor Laird participated in the analysis of the results and in the writing of the report. The research staff spent four days in a writing conference in July, 1967, with Drs. John Thompson, Saul Cohen, William Engbretson, Richard Longaker, and Mr. John Cogan; at this conference, the results were studied in detail and the outline of the present report was formulated. Preliminary drafts of the report were examined by the members of the writing conference and by the Executive Committee of the Consortium; the final version of the report has benefitted extensively from their comments.

This edition of the report has been prepared in October, 1967, for advance circulation. A later, bound edition will be issued by the Consortium Office.

Contents

Preface	i
Contents	ii
Index of Tables	iii
I. Introduction	1
Development of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program	1
Evaluation of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program	2
II. An Overview of the Results	5
III. The Population and the Programs	9
Characteristics of the Participants	9
Characteristics of the Faculty	12
Characteristics of the Programs	13
IV. A Profile of Reactions to the Program	15
Satisfaction and Effectiveness	15
Structural Aspects of the Programs	20
Operating Strategies	22
General Summary of Impressions of the Program	29
V. Correlates of Effectiveness and Satisfaction	30
The Role of the Director in Program Effectiveness	30
Some Comments on Correlational Methods	31
Correlations Among Measures of Effectiveness and Satisfaction	32
The Relationship Between Program Effectiveness and Program Structure	34
The Relationship Between Program Effectiveness and Program Strategy	37
Summary: Correlates of Effectiveness	43

Index of Tables

1. Comparisons of Fellows with Typical Graduate Students Made by Faculty and Program Directors 11

2. Ratings by Faculty, Directors, and Fellows of How Stimulating and Interesting They Found the Program 16

3. Comparisons by Faculty, Directors, and Fellows of ExTFP and Other Institutes 17

4. Estimates by Faculty, Directors, Fellows, and Evaluators of Whether the Program Met Fellows' Needs 18

5. Ratings by Faculty, Directors, and Fellows of Group Solidarity and Morale 20

6. Judgments of Whether Programs Built Upon Fellows' Experience and Preparation 23

7. Ratings by Faculty and Directors of Whether the Program was Challenging and Satisfying 25

8. Judgments by Faculty and Directors of the Program's Effects on Their Own Development 26

9. Judgments by Faculty, Directors and Evaluators of the Program's Effects upon Institutional Development 28

10. Correlations among Measures of Effectiveness and Satisfaction 33

11. Correlations among Measures of Solidarity and Morale 34

12. Correlations of Solidarity and Morale with Program Effectiveness 35

13. Correlations among Measures of Departmental and Institutional Cooperation 36

14. Correlations of Departmental Cooperation with Program Effectiveness 36

15. Correlations among Measures of Whether the Programs Utilized Fellows' Backgrounds 37

16. Correlations of Utilization of Participants' Backgrounds with Program Effectiveness 38

Index of Tables (Continued)

17. Correlations among Measures of Competitiveness and Work Load 39

18. Correlations of Competitiveness and Work Load with Program Effectiveness 39

19. Correlations among Measures of Faculty Involvement 40

20. Correlations of Faculty Involvement with Program Effectiveness 41

21. Correlations of Innovativeness with Program Effectiveness 42

22. Correlations among Measures of Effects on Institutional Development 42

23. Correlations of Effects on Institutional Development with Program Effectivness 43

I. Introduction

The Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program is a unique and imaginative venture. Its ultimate objective, and that of two other, closely related programs, is to improve the quality of education in the nation's elementary and secondary schools. The three programs pursue this objective in two ways: by assisting selected, potentially influential teachers to pursue full-time graduate education in specially planned courses of study, and by fostering and strengthening an increased concern for the training of teachers. The Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program sponsors special programs that provide financial support for graduate studies to teachers with field experience. A second program, the Prospective Teacher Fellowship Program, supports similar kinds of programs for individuals who have no teaching experience but who expect to become elementary or secondary school teachers. The third program, the Institutional Assistance Grant Program, awards financial grants to strengthen the graduate programs for teacher preparation in institutions that have already been awarded either an Experienced or a Prospective Teacher Fellowship Program. The present report summarizes a preliminary study of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program.

A. The Development of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program.

The history of the ExTFP belies the generalization that governmental programs develop slowly. It was authorized under Title V, Part C of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Guidelines for the program were distributed in two letters, dated December 27, 1965, and January 10, 1966. The deadline for mailing completed proposals was January 20; a panel of consultants read, evaluated, and rated the proposals in the period from January 24 to 26; and the announcement of awards was made in February, barely two months after the first guideline was sent out. The first students began their study in June, 1966.

Despite the speed with which the program was mounted, almost 1,000 proposals were submitted for the academic year 1966-67. Fifty of these proposals were funded, enabling just over a thousand experienced teachers, from all parts of the country and representing diverse disciplines, to spend a year (in a few programs, two years) in full-time graduate study.

In its underlying assumptions, the conception of the ExTFP was broad and inclusive. In the guidelines, no limits were suggested as to the range of subject matter that would be supported; no premium was placed on either innovation or traditionalism in educational procedures, and there was no attempt to specify in detail the structure that the graduate programs should adopt. There was, however, the assumption that graduate education is most effective when the courses a student takes are related to one another in a meaningful fashion. The guidelines for ExTFP proposals incorporated this assumption by setting three restrictions on authors of proposals:

First, evidence was required of more than perfunctory cooperation between subject-matter and teacher-education specialists. All proposals were required to demonstrate that a suitable faculty could be arranged for, composed of members of "teacher education" and

"non-teacher education" departments Further, both the chairman or dean for the substantive aspect of the program and the chairman or dean for teacher education were required to sign the proposal before it was submitted.

Second, institutions were required to adopt an en bloc procedure, by designing a program for the entire group of fifteen to thirty fellows, rather than leaving the individual fellows "to the mercy of the catalogue's cafeteria-like offerings, so often unsuited to the needs of experienced personnel." The en bloc mode of organization was also to provide greater visibility of the program on the campus as well as increased opportunity for fellows to profit from interaction with their peers and from formal instruction by their professors.

Third, the guidelines encouraged cooperation between the institution of higher education and the local school district or system. This was fostered in part by the requirement that fellows be selected jointly by their home educational system and by the college or university concerned. School administrators were required to recommend applicants, and applicants were expected to return to the school systems from which they came. In addition, in order to confront the realities of teaching in schools, cooperation was encouraged between colleges and local school systems, to provide a meaningful practicum experience for the participants.

The fifty programs that were funded were held in forty-seven different colleges and universities. Programs were conducted in 17 different disciplines, ranging from general fields of education (elementary education, teaching the disadvantaged, and counseling and guidance) through the traditional liberal arts disciplines, and including specialized areas such as health education, the school library, and educational media. The fellows were drawn from every part of the country and from schools which served every economic level; their educational assignments ranged from preschool to high school.

B. Evaluation of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program

1. Three Projected Evaluation Studies

Just as the ExTFP was planned and instituted with considerable speed, so, also, were the procedures for studying the program's effectiveness. Barely three months elapsed between the formation of a research team and completion of data collection for the present report. During that time, a plan has taken form which foresees a series of three related investigations of the effectiveness of the ExTFP: a questionnaire study of responses to the first year's program; during the second year, a field investigation of the operation of the ExTFP in three different institutions; and, in the third year, another study of the entire set of institutions then involved in the ExTFP. Each successive investigation will build on the results obtained by those preceding.

The first of these studies, based on questionnaires and visits by teams to selected programs, will be described at length below. The intensive pilot study of three individual programs will be carried out during the academic year 1967-68; it will involve repeated interviews with participants and faculty in each institution and the periodic administration

of questionnaires and other tests. The extensive body of information that will be obtained will permit an acquaintance in depth with the operation of these three institutions, making it possible to identify factors that appear to account for the effects the programs have upon the fellows, the faculty, and the institution. An important aspect of this second study will be interviews with the fellows after they have returned to their home schools in 1968-69. The third investigation, to be initiated during the academic year 1968-69, will be an extensive study of all the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Programs then in operation, using self-report measures, interviews, and observations, all developed out of earlier research experiences.

2. The Procedures Used in the Present Investigation

The present report rests upon two kinds of data: responses to questionnaires that were administered to the individuals who were actually involved in the program, and reports by teams of evaluators who visited 31 of the 50 programs.

Four questionnaires were constructed for administration to those involved in the programs. Each questionnaire borrowed heavily from those used in earlier studies of summer institutes. One questionnaire, containing some 60 different items, was administred to the fellows at the institutions they attended, under conditions which assured anonymity. Completed questionnaires were obtained from 940 of the 1,004 fellows, representing 49 of the 50 institutions.[1]

The director at each institution was asked to supply the names of the full-time and part-time staff of his program. A copy of a second questionnaire, about equal in length to the student questionnaire, was then mailed to every full-time faculty member and to five randomly-selected part-time faculty members on each campus. Completed questionnaires were obtained from 187 faculty members, in 47 different institutions.

A third questionnaire, sent to the director at each institution, was identical to the faculty questionnaire except that it contained an additional set of ten items concerning the administration of the program. Of the 50 directors, 45 returned these questionnaires in time for analysis in the present report.

The fourth questionnaire, intended to assess the impact of the program upon the existing teacher-education procedures at the institutions, was sent to the director of teacher education on each campus. Response to this questionnaire was spotty; for this reason, these replies will not be discussed in detail in this report.

---

[1]Questionnaires were not received from the program in Social Studies at the University of Minnesota.

The evaluation teams, which visited 31 of the 50 programs, normally consisted of three persons: a specialist in the subject matter of the institute, a specialist in teacher education, and a teacher experienced in the relevant subject matter.[1] Some 85 members of these evaluation teams met in early April with the research team, members of CONPASS, and representatives from the Office of Education for a discussion of the evaluation rating scale and of the procedure that was to be followed in the evaluation visit. They then spent two days on the campuses to which they were assigned, meeting with faculty, students, and administrators, visiting classes, and reviewing the general operation of the programs. Subsequently, each team member individually completed a Visitors Evaluation Form, containing 24 different items. For each item, the evaluator rated the program on a 7-point scale, and then was asked to provide a written analysis of that aspect of the program's operation in explanation of his rating. In addition to the individual reports, the team members submitted a combined evaluation on each item of the evaluation form; this last report represented the consensus of all the team members.

---

[1]Because of difficulties in scheduling members of evaluation teams, three institutions were visited by teams of only two members; at two institutions, the team contained four members.

II. An Overview of the Results

In the following chapters a detailed report will be made of the results of this study. The purpose of the present chapter is to point out the highlights of these results.

For the most part, fellows who took part in the Program were relatively young teachers, but experienced ones. Their ability and motivation, apparently, was extremely high; according to program directors and faculty members, the fellows were at least equal, if not superior, in quality and motivation to the regular graduate students at the institutions concerned. The educational attainments and experience of faculty members suggests that the average teacher in the Program, also, was more than adequately qualified. Thus, the great majority of the fifty programs possessed the two principal qualifications for an effective academic program: an able, highly motivated student body and a capable, concerned faculty.

The extent to which the Program's potential effectiveness was realized and the general correlates of effectiveness may conveniently be summarized by six broad generalizations; for the specific results on which these generalizations are based, the reader should consult the body of the report.

1. The reaction to the Program by program directors, faculty members, fellows, and evaluation teams was overwhelmingly favorable.

As a general rule, the extent of a source's enthusiasm about the Program varied with that source's degree of professional investment in it: directors' responses were usually more favorable than those by faculty members, faculty members were more favorable than fellows, and fellows more favorable than evaluators. But this general rule held within a context of over-all favorableness toward the program. Specific evidence of the widespread approval that was generated may be found throughout the results. The extent of this approval may be illustrated by the fact that 82% of the fellows reported that their own program was either usually stimulating and interesting or stimulating and interesting throughout. Responses by faculty members and program directors to the identical item were even more favorable. Similarly, the majority of respondents in each of the four roles -- directors, faculty members, fellows, and evaluators -- reported that the Program had clearly met the educational needs of the fellows. Even the few evaluation teams which were sharply critical of an individual program took care to comment favorably on the over-all concept of the ExTFP.

There was, of course, a considerable variation among institutions in the evaluations that were received: some programs were given extremely high ratings, a few received relatively low evaluations. It must be stressed again, however, that this variation took place around an average value that was very favorable, indeed.

2. There was a high degree of solidarity and morale among fellows in the average program; the level of solidarity and morale correlated positively with judgments of effectiveness.

Again there was considerable variation in the level of morale and solidarity that characterized the different institutions; nevertheless, the average program received high ratings on morale and solidarity from directors, faculty members, fellows, and evaluators alike. Beyond this, there were consistent positive correlations between estimates of solidarity and morale and judgments of the effectiveness of individual programs: programs where morale and solidarity were high also received high ratings on effectiveness and participant satisfaction; when morale and solidarity were low, so were ratings of satisfaction and effectiveness.

3. The amount of work assigned was heavy, and inversely related to effectiveness and satisfaction.

Of the 31 evaluation teams, none said the fellows' work load was too light, while 21 said it was in some degree too heavy; of 940 fellows, only 6 said the load was too light and 440 said it was "too heavy to allow completion of assignments and independent work." Of particular interest was the inverse relationship between fellows' and evaluators' judgments on this question and the various measures of satisfaction and effectiveness: institutions where the amount of work required was judged to be inordinately high were consistently ranked as relatively ineffective. It should be noted that this relationship held for the absolute amount of work that was required, not for the amount of competitiveness that was fostered between fellows. In the average program, fellows reported a fairly large amount of competition with one another; however, these latter ratings did not relate consistently either to judgments of the over-all work load or to ratings of effectiveness and satisfaction.

4. Respondents in different roles disagreed as to whether the programs built on the extensive backgrounds of fellows; judgments by fellows and evaluators on this question correlated positively with measures of effectiveness.

Almost all of the program directors and a large majority of the faculty reported that the curriculum at their institution utilized and built upon the experience of the fellows; most of the evaluation teams indicated the reverse; answers by the fellows to this question were intermediate, but more similar to the faculty's than to the evaluators'. Despite their disagreement in the level at which they felt the fellows' experience was utilized, evaluation teams and fellows agreed in their rankings of institutions on their achievement of this goal. Furthermore, those programs which, according to fellows and evaluators, managed somehow to build upon the fellows' experience received more favorable ratings on program effectiveness than those which did not.

5. Respondents in different roles disagreed as to the extent of cooperation among programs and the amount of innovation in the programs; departmental cooperation, but not innovation was correlated with program effectiveness.

For the most part, directors and faculty members involved in the Program reported that

cooperation among different departments was good, that the Program had considerable effects on teacher-education procedures, and that it contributed to the plans for development of the department and institution concerned. Evaluation teams did not make such favorable judgments. Although in some institutions evaluators said that the Program had affected interdepartmental cooperation, teacher training, or departmental development, in as many other institutions evaluators felt that it had little effect on such policies. It seems likely that the evaluators' judgments were somewhat closer to reality than those of the directors and faculty; that within the few months of the Program's operation it had effected few, if any, really substantial changes in the structure of most of the host institutions. It is worth noting, however, that there was a positive correlation between judgments of program effectiveness on the one hand and, on the other, reports by evaluators and by fellows of effective interdepartmental cooperation.

As with judgments of effects upon host institutions, program directors and faculty members were much more likely than evaluators to report that their programs contained imaginative innovations. Again it is likely that the evaluators' judgments were more objective than those by the other two groups, and that as many programs introduced few educational innovations as introduced many. It is noteworth that evaluator estimates of the extent of innovations was uncorrelated with judgments of program effectiveness.

As adequate a summary as any of the effects of the Program upon the host institution can be given by quoting from an interim report on this project, written in May, 1967:

> The Programs appear to have been least effective in overcoming the traditional patterns of organization in colleges and universities. Thus, the most common complaints [by evaluation teams] dealt with the similarity of these programs to traditional undergraduate and graduate education, the imposition of a common body of required courses upon all participants, the failure to adjust the curriculum to the needs of individual students, the absence of true collaboration between different departments of the same institution, or the unconcern of the staff for the response to the Program of the fellows as a group. All of these complaints are commonly voiced throughout higher education in America; they are not unique to the Experienced Teachers Fellowship Program. It is significant that a considerable number of institutions were adjudged to provide for their fellows an unusual and rewarding educational experience, some by following traditional educational patterns, other by breaking with tradition and establishing novel and exciting educational procedures.

6. The program director has an extremely important role in determining the effectiveness of individual programs.

A partial enumeration of the functions that a program director performs yields a list of impressive length. He should be directly involved in deciding upon the course content and the mode of organization of the program, he must make sure that the formal courses and

the supplemental activities are coordinated, must arrange for the presence of whatever educational materials are required, must encourage informal exchanges among fellows and between fellows and staff, must try to mediate in disputes that may develop among participants, must ascertain the fellows' and the faculty's views and criticisms of the program and its effectiveness, must decide whether changes in procedures or content are required, and, when the decision is affirmative, must determine what changes to make in the program and how to make them. In a program whose success relies in good part upon the establishment of high esprit de corps among participants and upon the group's performance en bloc, the fulfillment of these functions can be critically important. There are doubtless some programs which run smoothly from beginning to end, never requiring the mediating influence of a skillful administrator. In the typical institution, however, at some time during the year crises arise, interests conflict, difficulties occur which require effective administrative action. At such times it is essential that the program director possess the ability, the time, and especially, the institutional power to respond effectively to the demands of the situation.

III. The Population and the Programs

We have already remarked that the ExTFP embraced a wide variety of offerings. Programs varied not only in the type of institutions that were involved, in the geographic region where the institutions were located, in the characteristics of fellows they enrolled, and in the subject matter that they offered; beyond this, they differed remarkably in the pedagogical strategy that they adopted: some were innovative, others traditional; some strove for competitiveness among fellows, other sought a non-competitive atmosphere; some established informal relationships between fellows and faculty, others maintained formal relationships. The programs and the individuals involved in them differed in these general ways and in all other ways in which people differ. Our purpose in this section of the report is to summarize some of the characteristics of the fellows, the faculty, and the programs. In succeeding sections, we shall discuss reactions to these programs, and shall look for variables that correlated with their effectiveness. It may sometimes appear that the differences among programs are obscured in the course of this analysis, that diversity is reduced to uniformity. If so, the reader should bear in mind that we are seeking for whatever underlying constancy there may be beneath the remarkable surface diversity.

A. Characteristics of the Participants

1. Personal Characteristics

In certain of their personal characteristics the group of fellows was not entirely representative of teachers as a whole. Men made up 51% of the group, no doubt a higher proportion than obtains among teachers in general. In addition, the group was relatively young, with 79% being younger than 40 and 28% younger than 30. Despite their relative youth, the participants were not inexperienced in teaching. Ninety-two percent reported three or more years of experience in education; 59% had six or more years of experience; however, only 24% had ten or more years of experience. The participants' experience spanned all levels of elementary and secondary education: 32% had been principally involved at the high school level, 21% at the junior high school level, 45% at the elementary level, and 2.6% in preschool or kindergarten teaching.

Apparently, the fellows' considerable experience and training had not been primarily in the subject matter areas of their respective programs, for sixty-one percent had worked as "specialists" in their areas for less than 3 years, while only 28% reported taking as many as 30 semester hours of undergraduate credit in their specialty -- the presumed equivalent of an undergraduate major. Seventy percent had taken fewer than 10 hours of graduate credit in their special area, and a third reported no graduate courses at all in that area. Two thirds had never attended an NDEA summer institute or similar training program, and only a tenth had attended more than one such program.

It is noteworthy that only 3% of the participants had held administrative jobs when they entered the program. Of those not in administrative positions, 55% said they "probably" or "definitely" would not go into full-time educational administration, while only 6% said they definitely expected to do so. Upon completion of the program, these fellows will doubtless be in a favored position on the promotional ladder of their home school systems; their apparent reluctance to move into administrative positions bespeaks a strong commitment to classroom teaching. It will be important to examine, in future years, the actual career patterns of these fellows.

2. Characteristics of Fellows' Home Communities and Schools

Fellows were distributed according to the size of the communities they came from in numbers roughly proportional to the distribution in the population as a whole. Thirty-three percent were from communities with less than 2,500 residents, 40% from towns or cities with populations between 2,500 and 100,000, 16% from cities between 100,000 and 500,000 population, and 19% from cities of over 500,000. Only 14% of the fellows identified their school system as being in a suburb or satellite city.

At least some participants came from each part of the country. The Western and Midwestern states were somewhat over-represented, with 24% and 33%, respectively, of all participants; 23% of the fellows were from the North Atlantic states, about the same proportion as in the population at large; the Southeastern, South Central, and Southwestern states were somewhat under-represented, comprising only 19% of the total.

As to school enrollment, there were fellows from schools with fewer than 200 students, others from schools with over 2,000, and still others in every category intermediate between these extremes.

Most commonly, fellows reported that their students came from families of middle income. Families with low but steady income were reported next most frequently, and either wealthy families or those in poverty were reportedly a small minority of the clientele of most fellows' schools. Sixty-eight percent reported that the pupils in their home schools were "all or mostly white"; the remainder reported that their pupils were predominantly Spanish-speaking, Indian, Negro, or a combination of two or more ethnic groups. Only about 15% of the school-age children in America are nonwhite; therefore, it appears that the proportion of teachers in the ExTFP who came from classrooms with substantial numbers of nonwhite children was somewhat greater than in the nation as a whole. Since five of the 50 programs were for teachers of the disadvantaged, such an outcome is not surprising.

3. Ability and Interests of Fellows

No information is available concerning the fellows' performance on standardized tests of ability. However, there were items on each of the questionnaires which requested

fellows, faculty, and directors to estimate the fellows' ability. By all three sets of judgments, the fellows came off extremely well. Thus, 83% of the fellows said that the participants' ability was above average and 95% reported that fellows seemed genuinely interested in the subject matter.

The faculty and directors were asked to compare the ability of the ExTFP fellows with that of their institution's regular graduate students. The results of these comparisons are summarized in Table 1. It is clear that the fellows were viewed very favorably by both sources, with program directors being consistently more favorable than the faculty. Note that more than half the faculty and directors reported that fellows were more industrious, more serious, and had greater initiative than their regular graduate students; nearly as much preference was given to fellows over graduate students in their commitment to the discipline and their ability to communicate. The faculty thought that the two groups were about equal in intellectual ability, while directors favored the fellows; similarly, the faculty rated graduate students somewhat higher than fellows in knowledge of the discipline, while directors' ratings were the reverse. Considering that graduate students constitute a very select group for comparison, these results provide an extremely favorable picture of the fellows' capacities.

Table 1. Comparisons of Fellows with Typical Graduate Students Made by Faculty and Program Directors

Variable	Source of Rating	Percent[1] Who Rated Participants		
		Better	Equal	Worse
Intellectual ability	Faculty	24	46	28
	Directors	29	56	13
Industriousness	Faculty	60	33	2
	Directors	65	31	0
Seriousness	Faculty	66	27	3
	Directors	67	29	0
Commitment to discipline	Faculty	46	34	14
	Directors	67	20	9
Knowledge of discipline	Faculty	25	38	30
	Directors	34	38	22
Ability to communicate	Faculty	40	45	13
	Directors	43	44	9
Initiative	Faculty	53	40	4
	Directors	64	27	4

[1]Since non-respondents are not included in this table, the percentages in each row do not total 100.

It is of interest, as well, to examine what the fellows considered to be their greatest problem before enrolling in the ExTFP. They reported as follows:

23%	Using effective teaching methods
20%	Knowledge of the subject matter
16%	Motivating students
14%	Determining what is most important to teach
12%	Handling students of low ability
6%	Knowledge of appropriate materials
3%	Encouraging and stimulating gifted students

One derives from these data a picture of a young, energetic, serious, industrious group of teachers, with considerable experience and a strong commitment to their work. The communities that the fellows were drawn from seem to be approximately representative of the nation as a whole except, perhaps, that the South was somewhat under-represented and that schools with substantial numbers of nonwhite students were somewhat over-represented. The fact that fellows were relatively untrained in the specialized subject matter of their programs, combined with their intellectual ability and their sincerity of purpose, suggests that they were especially likely to benefit from their graduate work.

B. Characteristics of the Faculty

The educational and professional background of faculty members in the ExTFP was impressive. Seventy-three percent held either the Ph.D. or the Ed.D. degree; 80% had taught at the college level for three or more years, 60% for six or more years, and 25% for more than 16 years. In addition, 37% had taught for at least a year in elementary school and 51% had a year or more of experience at the secondary level. Thus, many of the faculty were acquainted at first hand with the educational settings from which the participants came and for which they were being trained.

Two sets of questions bear on the quality of instruction at the different institutions, one set from the evaluation teams, the other from the fellows. When asked to comment on the qualifications of the teaching staff, 28 of the 31 evaluation teams rated them on the "qualified" side of the continuum, two placed their ratings at the midpoint, and only one team rated the staff as slightly unqualified.

The fellows' ratings of the faculty are similar to those that would be given by college students in a course that was somewhat better than average. Thus, over two-thirds of the fellows rated the quality of lectures as good or excellent; 56% gave the same evaluation to seminars and structured discussions. The great majority of fellows said that the lectures were seldom or never over their heads (a response which might, in fact, be either positive or negative), that the instructors did not talk down to them, and that the lectures dealt with various approaches to the subject. However, 41% believed that lectures were sometimes or usually dominated by detail or unrelated facts, and a slight majority

(51%) reported that the faculty had little or no knowledge of the practical problems of school teachers. It should be noted that this last opinion does not wholly square with the faculty members' reports of their own background in elementary and secondary school teaching.

In sum, the instructors at the various institutions seem to have been quite well qualified. Reactions of fellows to the teaching were mixed, although on the positive side. The response to lectures and seminars was quite positive; on the other hand, there was some feeling -- based, perhaps, on the academic nature of most programs and on the fellows' concern about the material's applicability in the classroom -- that not enough attention was given to the "practical" problems of teachers.

C. Characteristics of the Programs

The guidelines for proposals for the ExTFP emphasized en bloc programming, cooperation between education and subject-matter departments, and attention to the special character and experience of the participants; these requirements demanded of program planners a type of co-ordination that may not have been in effect at many institutions. Although the guidelines specifically stated that educational innovation was not a requirement for proposals, in fact the proposals which were funded were novel and extremely diverse.[1] It is this diversity which is most characteristic of the group of programs as a whole. Of the 50 programs, the largest number whose titles were approximately similar is four, and there seem to be 24 different kinds of programs indicated by the titles alone. Actually, except for the structural uniformities called for by the guidelines, there was little similarity between any two programs on more than a few dimensions. The dimensions along which programs varied may conveniently be divided into two classes, (1) organizational and situational characteristics and (2) goals and rationale.

Organizational and situational characteristics. The vast majority (84%) of the programs were situated, geographically, in one of three areas, the Midwest (38%), West (25%) or Northeast (21%). The remaining 16% of the programs were scattered across the Southeast, South Central, and Southwest regions.

The programs ranged in size from 5 to 25 participants, with 25 the most common number (34%), followed by 20 (28%) and 15 (20%). Only two programs had a participant group of 5 or fewer. The guidelines specified there should be cooperation between education and subject matter departments, but in every case one department bore primary responsibility as "home" for the program. The programs were approximately equally divided in their locations, with 29 programs based in education departments and 21 based in other departments.

---

[1] One reason for the novelty and diversity among the 50 programs that were actually funded may be that the advisory panels used innovation and diversity as criteria in deciding which proposals to recommend for approval or disapproval, even though these criteria were not specifically set forth in the guidelines.

Great latitude was permitted to institutions in the actual functioning of the programs. For instance, many awarded an MA degree at the completion of the program, others provided the possibility of an MA upon completion of some further work, and some made no provision for an advanced degree at all. Among those awarding an MA degree, some required a thesis, most did not. The choices of teaching techniques were related to the goals of the programs, but again there were great variations among programs with apparently similar goals. Some programs, particularly those whose purpose seemed to be to upgrade and educate teachers in existing areas such as History or Mathematics, provided a menu of conventional courses from which participants selected, much as in a conventional MA program. Others, particularly those programs which reportedly they were training for a "new" kind of function, such as media consultant or teacher of the disadvantaged, provided a real "bloc" of courses identical for each participant, and often very different from any courses taught elsewhere in the institution. Seminars, workshops and practica were in general more common in the latter programs than in conventional graduate sequences.

As to the goals which programs pursued, their diversity has already been mentioned. Programs ranged from fairly conventional, though certainly important, attempts to upgrade the content, knowledge, and techniques of teachers of English, History, or Geography to the creation of a "unique person in the educational setting" such as a centralized media specialist or an educational systems analyst. There were five programs to train teachers of different disadvantaged groups, including rural Alaskan Indians, Texas Mexican-Americans, and Harlem Negroes.

In 18 programs the principal emphasis was on secondary school teachers, in 17 the emphasis was at the primary level, and at least four covered both levels. In addition, there were 10 programs for the training of coordinating or advisory personnel, such as guidance counselors, media specialists and school librarians.

IV. A Profile of Reactions to the Program

This section of the report will consider reactions to the Program by fellows, faculty members, directors, and evaluators. It begins with the degree of satisfaction that was expressed, then proceeds to various judgments of the Program's effectiveness. A discussion then follows of how and whether the various programs implemented the three requirements regarding program structure that were spelled out in the guidelines: the importance of an en bloc approach, the necessity for subject-matter and teacher education departments to work closely with each other, and the requirement that relationships be established with the local school systems. Finally, we will discuss what might be called the "strategy of operation" adopted by the different programs, including the extent to which the programs made use of the extensive experience of the fellows, the amount of competitiveness that was fostered among fellows, their work load, the extent of faculty involvement in the program, and the amount of innovation in the curriculum.

A. Satisfaction and Effectiveness

It is not easy to differentiate between a person's satisfaction with an educational program and his judgments of its effectiveness. Presumably, the two kinds of responses should vary with one another -- indeed, we shall see in the next section that they co-vary to a remarkable extent; nevertheless, the distinction seems worthwhile, for satisfaction with a program refers to one's overall emotional response; a program is judged to be effective or ineffective according to whether it achieves the goals the respondent expects of it. Thus, a program might conceivably be effective without necessarily producing high levels of satisfaction among the participants, and vice versa. We consider, first, the extent of satisfaction with the ExTFP, then judgments of its effectiveness.

1. Satisfaction With the Program

Two questions which appear to reflect satisfaction with the ExTFP were included in substantially the same form in the questionnaires given to the fellows, to the faculty, and to the directors. One of these deals directly with reactions to the Program:

> Which of the following alternatives best describes your reaction to the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program?
>
> _____ It was a stimulating and interesting experience throughout.
> _____ It was usually stimulating and interesting.
> _____ It was only occasionally stimulating and interesting.
> _____ It was seldom or never stimulating and interesting.

A comparison of the responses of the three groups is given in Table 2. Clearly, the reaction in every group was overwhelmingly favorable, with faculty members somewhat more favorable than fellows, and directors the most favorable of all. It should be under-

lined that among even the least enthusiastic group, the fellows in the program, 82% reported that the ExTFP was either usually stimulating and interesting or stimulating and interesting throughout.

Table 2. Ratings by Faculty, Directors, and Fellows of How Stimulating and Interesting They Found the Program

Source	Percent Saying ExTFP Was Stimulating and Interesting			
	Throughout	Usually	Occasionally	Seldom or Never
Faculty	42	46	8	1
Directors	60	38	2	0
Fellows	32	50	16	1

The second item that may be considered a measure of satisfaction asked faculty and fellows for a comparison of the Program with a typical eight-week summer institute. Faculty members and directors who had taught in such programs, but not those who had not, were asked to compare the ExTFP with NDEA or NSF academic year or summer institutes. Since fellows had earlier reported whether they had ever attended such institutes, it was possible to divide them into two groups: those with and those without prior institute experience. The four sets of comparisons of the ExTFP with other institutes are presented in Table 3.

Again, it is evident that the response to the ExTFP was overwhelmingly favorable. On this item, the fellows were more likely than the other two groups to view the ExTFP as superior to other institutes, and those who had not taken part in such institutes were somewhat more favorable than those who had. Again, the directors showed somewhat greater approval of the ExTFP than did the faculty. Of greater importance than these inter-group comparisons, however, is the fact that only a tiny fraction of the respondents in any group felt that other kinds of institutes were superior to the ExTFP.[1]

---

[1]It must be emphasized that these judgments are almost certainly expressions of satisfaction with the ExTFP instead of a true reflection of the relative effectiveness of that Program and other institutes. Many factors were involved in these responses: fellows in the ExTFP had committed a full year or longer to that program; their stipends were larger than those paid in the summer institutes and they extended over a full year instead of eight weeks; many of the ExTFP fellows were receiving advanced degrees or credit toward such degrees. In short, ExTFP fellows and staff were comparing a present valued experience to a distant one; their comparisons can hardly be considered unbiased judgments of effectiveness; as expressions of satisfaction, however, the results are impressive.

Table 3. Comparisons by Faculty, Directors, and Fellows of ExTFP and Other Institutes

Source	Percent of Group in Each Response Category				
	ExTFP Superior	ExTFP Somewhat Better	About the Same	Institute Somewhat Better	Institute Superior
Faculty with Institute Experience (N=57)	28%	21%	37%	9%	5%
Directors with Institute Experience (N=21)	52%	19%	19%	5%	5%
Fellows without Institute Experience (N=486)[1]	80%	13%	5%	1%	1%
Fellows with Institute Experience (N=312)	65%	18%	8%	6%	2%

[1]A number of respondents omitted this item; the totals on which the responses are based are those who actually responded.

2. Judgments of Program Effectiveness

Unfortunately, the questionnaire method does not provide a fully satisfactory means of determining the effectiveness of an educational program. Subjective ratings can provide, at best, imperfect estimates of what a student has learned from a set of material or of how well his new knowledge will be applied when he returns to his earlier role. Whether a student has profited a little or a great deal from a program should be assessed by comparing what he knows at the program's end with what he knew at its beginning; similarly, whether he will apply what he has learned can be determined adequately only by observing his performance on his home grounds. Nevertheless, in the absence of more reliable measures of program effectiveness, the subjective ratings that are obtained in questionnaires are considerably better than no estimates of effectiveness at all. Especially when the respondents are experienced judges of the effectiveness of educational programs -- and such is certainly the case in the present study -- one can expect their replies to the questionnaire to relate positively, if imperfectly, to more objective measures of program effectiveness. With the material at hand, we have no choice but to use questionnaire ratings of effectiveness. We cannot estimate the degree to which these ratings correspond to the "true" effectiveness of the different programs; nevertheless, we can reasonably assume that there is considerable validity in these judgments.

There was only one question relating to effectiveness which asked for approximately the same kind of judgment from faculty, directors, fellows, and evaluators. The form the question took varied considerably from one questionnaire to another. In the faculty and director questionnaires, respondents were asked: "In your opinion, were the educational needs of the participants met by the program?" Fellows were first asked to check, from among seven different teaching problems, the one that had concerned them most before they enrolled in the ExTFP. In the next item they were asked: "To what extent did the program this year meet that problem?" Finally, evaluation teams were asked to rate, on a seven-point scale, whether the program seemed to meet the needs of the participants. Responses of the four groups to these items are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Estimates by Faculty, Directors, Fellows, and Evaluators of Whether the ExTFP Met Fellows' Needs

	Were the educational needs of participants met?			
	Definitely	Probably	I doubt it	Not at all
Faculty	42%	49%	4%	0%
Directors	67%	31%	1%	0%
	To what extent did the program meet (your major teaching) problem?			
	To a great degree	To a moderate degree	To a slight degree	Not at all
Fellows	35%	39%	21%	6%
	Did the program seem to meet the needs of participants?			
	Well	Neutral	Poorly	
Evaluators	51%	32%	16%	

It is evident that the directors and faculty were both confident that the fellows' educational needs had been met, with the directors, once more, somewhat more positive than the faculty. The confidence of these two groups in the effectiveness of the Program is further revealed by their responses to two other questions. When asked whether the ExTFP resulted in the participants becoming better teachers, 72% of the faculty replied "yes" and 24% were uncertain (presumably for lack of direct observation of the fellows' teaching); the corresponding proportions for directors were 80% and 13%. Similarly, 92% of the faculty and 100% of the directors reported, in another item, that the overall program was either valuable or very valuable for the participants.

It may be seen in Table 4 that 74% of the fellows reported that the program had met their major problem to at least a moderate degree. While this is a substantial majority, it also leaves one fellow in four feeling that his major teaching problem was met to only a slight degree (21%) or not at all (6%). This outcome should not be taken as evidence that one fourth of the fellows thought the program was ineffective. It seems more likely that the ExTFP was not specifically directed at the major teaching problem of many of the fellows. For example, the major problem of 28% of the fellows was either motivating students or handling students of low ability; it is doubtful that most programs focused their instruction on those topics. A related item on the fellows' questionnaire asked them how useful the program had been in preparing them to handle their own teaching situations. Seventy-nine percent reported that it had been either moderately or extremely useful; 18% said it had been somewhat useful, and only 3% called the program not useful at all.

From Table 4 it appears that evaluators were somewhat less impressed with the effectiveness of the programs than were the other three groups. Just over half of the evaluation teams said the institutions they visited had met participants' needs well, while five teams said these needs were less than adequately met. These last five teams of evaluators remarked on the similarity of the programs they visited to regular undergraduate and graduate training, and also on the lack of adequate practicum experience. A much more favorable view of the programs was expressed in evaluators' judgments of whether the fellows would be able to apply what they had learned when they returned to their schools. Twenty-three of the 31 teams reported in the affirmative, four placed their ratings at the midpoint, and only four teams said that the students they observed were somewhat unlikely to be able to apply what they had learned. Several teams remarked that their judgments were less favorable than they might have been because they feared that traditionalist or money-conscious school systems might resist the introduction of some of the material the fellows would bring back with them from their year of training. A final indication of evaluators' views of the effectiveness of the Program comes from an analysis of the general comments they wrote at the end of the evaluators form. These comments revealed a clear acceptance, by all evaluators, of the general value of the ExTFP. Even those few evaluation teams which expressed rather extreme criticism of the institutions they visited felt that the fellows had profited in some degree from their year of study; their criticisms frequently stemmed from the conviction that substantially more could have been accomplished had the program been conducted differently.

In summary, it is clear that there was general satisfaction with the Program, and widespread agreement that it was an effective educational venture. It should not be surprising that the directors, faculty, and fellows expressed approval of the Program. When one devotes a full year to a project, there develops considerable internal pressure to view that project favorably. Despite this built-in bias, the overwhelming favorableness of the opinions given by these three sources strongly supports the conclusion that the ExTFP was a satisfying experience for fellows and staff alike. The evaluation teams had no personal involvement in the outcome of their evaluation. They were specifically assigned a critical role, and they measured the programs against high standards of success. Their generally positive evaluations provide further evidence of the program's effectiveness.

B. Structural Aspects of the Programs

Doubtless because of the lack of specificity in the guidelines, there was considerable variation in the pattern of organization adopted by different institutions in implementing the ExTFP. Since only a limited number of items dealt with such questions, many of these differences in program structure went unrecorded. Only three structural aspects of the programs will be dealt with here, all of them specifically discussed in the guidelines for proposals: the utilization of the en bloc approach, the relationship among teacher-education and content departments, and the pattern of relationship with local school systems.

1. The en bloc Approach, Group Solidarity, and Morale

Only one question dealt specifically with whether the en bloc approach was adopted by the various institutions; this was an item in the Visitors Evaluation Form which said "Unlike conventional graduate programs, the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program is based upon a block or group program approach. The intent is to use the group to enhance learning by building morale and esprit de corps. Has this been successful?"

Evaluators' responses make it clear that the en bloc approach was, indeed, successful: 12 evaluation teams reported that the approach was extremely successful and 13 others rated the approach as successful, but not extremely so. Only three teams said that the approach was in some degree unsuccessful.

Although the en bloc approach was not mentioned in the other three questionnaires, all three groups were asked whether there was a feeling of group solidarity among participants in the program; in addition, respondents were asked to rate the overall morale of the participants. The responses of the three groups are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Ratings by Faculty, Directors, and Fellows of Group Solidarity and Morale

Source	a. Was there a feeling of group solidarity? Percent Answering			
	Strong	Considerable	Some	None
Faculty	53	38	5	1
Directors	67	27	7	0
Fellows	46	38	14	1
Source	b. How would you rate fellows' morale?			
	Very High	Pretty High	Average	Low and Very Low
Faculty	23	51	14	4
Directors	38	42	18	2
Fellows	22	38	27	10

By every measure, solidarity and morale were high. Again, the directors' estimates of both variables were somewhat higher than those by the faculty, and the faculty's estimates were higher than those by the fellows; but even among the fellows, only 1% said there was no feeling of solidarity and only 10% reported that the group's morale was below average. It should be mentioned that there was considerable homogeneity within groups of fellows in their judgments of solidarity. That is, reports of relatively low solidarity were concentrated in particular institutions; they were not made by social isolates scattered among a number of programs but probably reflected, instead, a real lack of solidarity in a few of the programs.

2. Cooperation between Departments

It will be recalled that the guidelines for the ExTFP specifically called for cooperation between subject-matter and teacher-education departments in conducting the program. Three questions, one each from the fellows, the directors, and the evaluators questionnaires, asked whether such cooperation was achieved.

In some institutions, such cooperation apparently did not extend much beyond consultation on the initial application. When asked whether the director of teacher-education was involved in the operation of the ExTFP, only 26% of the program directors replied that he was either quite involved or very much involved; just over half said he was not very involved, and another 20% reported that he was not involved at all. This question, of course, asked only about the director of teacher education, not whether there was cooperation with others in lesser positions in the teacher-education hierarchy. In fact, when they were asked to describe the cooperation they received from other academic departments, 91% of the directors said it was either quite good or unusually good. This suggests that some collaboration must have taken place between teacher-education and subject-matter departments, or at least that the directors thought so. Evaluators' reports indicate that interdepartmental cooperation varied widely from one institution to another. While only one evaluation team reported very close cooperation between the two departments, another 12 placed their ratings at the cooperative side of the continuum. On the other hand, 15 of the evaluators' judgments were on the uncooperative side; in five of these institutions evaluators said there was no cooperation at all between teacher-education and subject-matter departments.

Responses by fellows show much the same picture as those by evaluators. Eighty-four percent of the fellows reported that their instruction involved more than one academic department. Exactly half of these, 42% of the total group, said the material was coordinated either quite well or extremely well; the other half, again 42% of the total group, said the material was either not coordinated too well or was not coordinated at all. We should recognize, however, that this question does not bear directly on the point at issue, for the second department which the fellows had in mind need not have been the department of teacher education. One other item on the participants' questionnaire had at least a tangential bearing on this question. In response to a question about the relative emphasis on subject matter and teaching methods, the majority of fellows, 64% said that the balance was about right, 28% reported that there was too much emphasis on subject matter, and only 3% reported too much emphasis on teaching methods.

3. Cooperation with Local School Systems

Only one question dealt with this topic: evaluators were asked to report how extensive the relationships were between colleges and universities and cooperating school districts. Again, there were great differences from one institution to another: fourteen institutions were rated on the low end of this continuum, 12 at the high end, and five at the midpoint. In the evaluators' written comments about the programs, some of the most caustic had to do with the lack of practicum experiences available to fellows in those institutions without relationships to cooperative school systems.

To summarize, the en bloc approach seems to have been effective in most of the institutions that participated in the ExTFP; it was accompanied by a high degree of solidarity in most of the groups, and by reports of high morale among the fellows. In the matter of cooperation between teacher-education and subject-matter departments, the program does not come off so well: in some institutions there was substantial cooperation of this sort, in others there was little or none. The same wide range held true for the extent of cooperation between the participating institutions and local school systems.

C. Operating Strategies

Even when programs have the same formal structure, there may be extensive differences in their mode of operation along a variety of dimensions. For example, graduate programs in American universities are known to differ in the degree of competitiveness that they foster among graduate students; it would be expected that ExTFP programs would also vary in this regard. Similarly, universities, and by extension the ExTFP programs, differ widely in the extent of faculty involvement with students and in faculty commitment to instruction.

Beyond this, the nature of the ExTFP suggests that there are other dimensions along which variation may be expected. The experience of teaching for a number of years has provided each fellow in the Program with a degree of specialization in his field, an awareness of the problems that are involved in teaching his subject, and an intellectual and emotional maturity that set him apart from the typical graduate and undergraduate student. His response to the program of courses that is offered should depend, in considerable part, on whether and how that program builds upon and utilizes his extensive experience.

We turn now to a discussion of differences among institutions in these aspects.

1. Utilization of Fellows' Background

All four sources -- fellows, faculty, directors, and evaluators -- were asked, in one way or another, whether they felt the program had taken advantage of the rich experience and prior preparation of the fellows. Although these questions were phrased differently for different populations, the four sets of responses have been grouped so that they are roughly comparable; they are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Judgments of Whether Programs Built Upon Fellows' Experience and Preparation[1]

Source	Percent of Each Group Responding		
	Yes	Uncertain	No
Faculty	66	23	6
Directors	89	7	4
Fellows	63	24	12
Evaluators	32	16	52

[1]In the faculty and directors questionnaires, the alternatives for respondents to check were "Yes," "Uncertain," and "No." Fellows who said that the program usually or consistently built on their backgrounds have been scored as replying "Yes," those who said it rarely did so are scored as "Uncertain," and those who said it was unconcerned for their background are scored as saying "No." Evaluators' responses are recorded as "Yes," "Uncertain," or "No" according to whether their judgments were on the positive side of the midpoint, at the midpoint, or on the negative side.

Clearly there was a considerable difference among sources in their judgments of whether the programs took account of fellows' backgrounds. Program directors were most likely to say that the programs had built on fellows' backgrounds; faculty members and fellows were somewhat less certain, but the clear majority of these two groups agreed with the directors that the program utilized the fellows' prior experience. Real disagreement with these judgments was shown by the evaluation teams, over half of whom said that the institutions they visited had not designed their programs to take account of fellows' experience. The comments of those teams that were critical, on these grounds, of the institutions they visited were examined in some detail. In an interim report, based on about half of these responses, comments by critical evaluation teams were summarized in a manner which holds true after the remainder of the data have been collected:

> Most commonly, [evaluators who were critical] remarked that fellows were treated like regular graduate students, complete with the institution of multiple-choice examinations and competition for letter grades, with the prescription of a fixed schedule of courses, with little tailoring of individual programs to the needs of individual fellows, and with little or no opportunity for fellows to exchange ideas with one another about their own experiences. In short, ...these institutions offered substantially the same kinds of programs they had always offered.

Why the other three sources at those same institutions should so strongly disagree with the evaluators' judgments remains unclear. Perhaps in their involvement with one institution, they were unable to conceive of the range of alternative policies that the evaluators envisioned; as a consequence, policies that these sources thought were major concessions to the fellows' experience may have been viewed by evaluators as modest efforts, at best. That faculty members and program directors actually did believe they had utilized the fellows' experience is made evident by their replies to a question asking whether their program was modified to take advantage of the experience and background of participants. Sixty-two percent of the directors and 36% of the faculty answered this question affirmatively, 9% and 40% were uncertain, and only 27% and 16% answered "no."

2. Competitiveness and Work Load

Our interest in discussing the extent of competitiveness and the size of fellows' work load is not to determine whether participants in the ExTFP worked or loafed, but to see whether they thought they were overworked and how intense was the competition among fellows. Unfortunately, the question that was asked of faculty members and directors appears to have been relevant to the first question, not to the second. It asked whether the students worked hard during the year. Eighty-four percent of the program directors and 79% of the faculty replied "yes," a bare 13% and 15% respectively of the two groups said "yes, too hard," and the remaining few respondents were uncertain or reported that fellows had not worked hard. In retrospect, these replies seem to reflect the respondents' approval of fellows in their programs more than their evaluation of the fellows' work load.

By contrast, fellows were about evenly divided between the opinion that their work load was about right (52% of the respondents) and the view that it was too heavy to allow completion of assignments and independent work (47%). Ratings by the evaluator teams also indicated that the work load in some schools was heavy: 10 of the 31 teams reported that the work load at the institution they visited was about right, the remaining 21 said that the work load was in some degree too heavy. As to competitiveness, 60% of the fellows said that the level of competition in their program was either quite high or extremely high, 31% said it was about right, and only 8% said it was either low or very low. It should be mentioned that there was considerable homogeneity of judgments on these items among fellows in the same programs; that is, in certain programs almost all of the fellows said the work load was too heavy, in others, almost all said it was about right.

A cogent comment on these judgments is the remark that graduate education involves a great deal of work wherever it occurs. Indeed, many of the evaluation teams who rated the work load as somewhat too heavy observed that such is the norm in graduate school, and that after the program was over fellows might cherish their experience the more for the fact that strenuous demands had been made of them. Nevertheless, it appears that some institutions did require far more work than their fellows could produce, thereby introducing severe emotional stress into the academic program.

3. Involvement of the Faculy

Assignment to teach in the ExTFP might have been accepted by a faculty member as simply another unit in his teaching load, requiring no change in the kind of material he presented, in the way he presented it, or in his involvement with the students. Alternatively, it might have been viewed as a special challenge which called for a somewhat different orientation toward both the subject matter and the students. The tone of the guidelines makes it clear that their intent is for the second attitude to be dominant among the staff of the ExTFP. There were no items in any questionnaire that dealt directly with the mode of orientation of the faculty, but there were a number that skirted it; we turn our attention now to those items.

Faculty members and program directors were asked whether they found the ExTFP a challenging and satisfying experience. As may be seen in Table 7, the majority of both groups replied in the affirmative to both questions. Program directors, once again, were somewhat more enthusiastic than the faculty.

Table 7. Ratings by Faculty and Directors of Whether the Program Was Challenging and Satisfying

Source	a. How Challenging was the ExTFP?			
	Extremely	Somewhat	Not Very	Not at All
Faculty	47	42	5	0
Directors	64	31	0	0
Source	b. How satisfying was the ExTFP?			
	Extremely	Somewhat	Not Very	Not at All
Faculty	57	40	3	1
Directors	71	24	0	0

The enthusiasm of the directors and faculty for teaching in the program was clearly picked up by the evaluation teams, for 22 of the 31 reported that the director and staff were challenged and stimulated by the program; only 8 gave judgments that fell toward the opposite pole of the continuum.

Fellows were not asked about whether the staff was challenged by the program, but whether they were accessible and helpful to students. Their responses were overwhelmingly favorable on both counts: 94% reported that the staff was either usually or always accessible, 95% said it was either usually or always helpful.

Although, as we have seen, the faculty and directors reported being challenged and stimulated by the Program, they were less likely to report that the experience affected their own professional and intellectual growth. As may be seen in Table 8, only 41% of the faculty said their professional development was furthered either "greatly" or "very greatly" by the experience; only about 30% said it added greatly or very greatly to their intellectual growth and to their skill as teachers. Again, directors were more generous in their estimates of how much benefit they derived from the Program; 51% said it added greatly or very greatly to their professional growth, but only about a third judged it had a comparable effect on their intellectual growth or their skills as teachers. In each case, respondents' judgments of the benefits they derived from the program were less favorable than their ratings of the challenge and satisfaction they felt. It is not clear how much weight should be given to these results. Perhaps the experienced University teacher does not ordinarily profit in these ways from his teaching experience. In any case, it is clear that the experience may have been stimulating and challenging but was not viewed as educational for the majority of the staff.

Table 8. Judgments by Faculty and Directors of the Program's Effects on Their Own Development

Item	Source	Percent Responding[1]				
		Very Greatly	Greatly	Moderately	Little	Very Little
28. Add to profession growth and development?	Faculty	14	27	35	14	5
	Director	18	36	42	2	0
29. Add to your intellectual growth?	Faculty	11	19	40	18	7
	Director	9	29	56	4	0
30. Add to your skill as a teacher?	Faculty	10	19	42	19	4
	Director	9	24	53	4	4

[1]Percentages in each row do not total to 100 because non-respondents are not included.

4. Departmental Innovativeness

It was not required that institutions prepare thoroughly innovative proposals in order that their programs be funded under the ExTFP. Instead, substantially traditional proposals were examined in competition with completely innovative ones; approval or disapproval for funding was not determined in terms of the program's novelty, but in terms of how effective it seemed likely to be in furthering the education of experienced teachers.

In the view of program directors, there was innovation in the great majority of the institutions. Of 42 directors who responded to this item, 32 said they had seen imaginative teaching methods and practices in their programs, 6 were unsure, and only 4 reported that they had not seen such practices. As usual, judgments by faculty members were less extreme: of 174 who responded to the item, 79 reported innovations, 22 were unsure, and 73 reported none.

The evaluation teams agreed more with the faculty than with the directors: 12 teams rated the institutions they visited as being on the innovative side of the midpoint, 12 ratings were on the noninnovative side, and the remaining 7 were exactly at the midpoint. None of the evaluator ratings fell in the most extreme categories, those which indicated either a great deal of imagination and innovation or none at all.

In summary, there was disagreement among sources in the extent to which they thought the programs had utilized the background and experience of their fellows; the least enthusiastic source of ratings, the evaluators, judged that there were more institutions which did not make sufficient use of the fellows' experience than there were which did. Apparently, there were systematic differences between institutions in the amount of work they assigned their students: every institution required a considerable amount of work, but some assigned an enormous amount. By all accounts, the faculty was challenged and stimulated by the program, accessible and helpful to the fellows. Finally, it appears that programs were neither thoroughly innovational nor stodgily traditional.

5. Effects on Institutional Development

One of the benefits the Program might have wrought, indeed, one of the effects that was envisioned initially, was a strengthening of the participating institutions themselves, particularly in their on-going teacher education programs. Obviously, changes in the pattern of teacher education will have effects upon the preparation and later performance of those who are trained; therefore, it is important to determine whether the Program actually influenced educational patterns in the host institutions. Important though this question may be, it is uncertain whether it can be answered adequately by the present study. These data were collected in the first year of the Program's operation, barely eight months after it was instituted. Whatever effects it may ultimately have upon procedures for teacher training, these effects are not likely to have taken place by the time these data were collected. Consequently, the conclusions we may draw about such effects must inevitably be tentative.

Of the five items that dealt with this issue, two were global judgments, by the directors and the faculty, of the Program's "value to the institution." One evaluator item asked about the Program's contribution to the plans of the Department, and two items, from the evaluators and the directors, asked specifically about the Program's "impact on the on-going teacher education program." Thus there were three distinct, if related, issues involved in these items: value to the institution, contribution to department development, and impact on teacher education.

As was so often the case, judgments on these questions varied remarkably from one source to another (Table 9). More than three fourths of the faculty members and the directors reported that the Program was either "valuable" or "very valuable" to their institution.

On the other hand, among evaluation teams as many said the program's contribution to departmental development was slight or non-existent as said it was moderate or great (36%, in each case). The same divergence of opinion was found in judgments of the Program's effect on teacher education: 62% of the directors said its impact on teacher education was relatively large and only 23% said it was small; the corresponding figures for evaluation teams were 16% and 58%.

Table 9. Judgments by Faculty, Directors, and Evaluators of the Program's Effects Upon Institutional Development

Source	a. Percent saying Program's value to institution[1]				
	Great	Moderate	Undecided	Slight	None
Directors	42	44	9	2	0
Faculty	29	47	13	5	1
	b. Contribution to departmental and institutional development				
Evaluators	26	10	29	26	10
	c. Impact on teacher education				
Directors	24	38	13	16	7
Evaluators	6	10	26	26	32

[1]To make results from three questionnaires comparable, responses to the Visitors Evaluation Form have been classified as follows: checks in either of the two most favorable categories are scored as judgments that the program had great effects; those in the third most favorable category are scored as reflecting moderate effects; those in the center category are classified as "undecided"; and responses are considered as imputing slight effects or none according to whether they fell in the third or in the two most unfavorable categories.

These differences in judgments by the different sources probably reflected a number of factors. For one thing, the directors and the faculty had more at stake in the Program than did the evaluators; no doubt this involvement influenced their judgments in a favorable direction. It is probably true, as well, that the different sources used different criteria to assess the effects of the Program; what looked like a remarkable advance in the context of a particular institution may have seemed trivial to an outside observer. Paradoxically, some of the disagreement in judgments may have occurred because institutional changes had been made before the ExTFP was undertaken: a few evaluation teams said the Program had little impact on teacher education because the existing procedures were advanced and effective; directors at those institutions attributed more influence on teacher training to the Program than did the evaluators.

One determinant of whether a change was effected in the host institution's teacher-training practices was the division of the institution in which the ExTFP was located. All five of the institutions that evaluation teams rated above the midpoint on "impact on teacher education" were based in education departments. Judgments by evaluation teams of the extent to which departmental and institutional development were affected showed the same patterns: 7 of the 8 programs in which evaluation teams said the effects were greatest were based in education departments. Not surprisingly, then, educational changes were more likely when Departments of Education were directly responsible for the Program; stated somewhat differently, educational programs that were located in Liberal Arts departments did not have immediate effects on the policies of education departments.

D. General Summary of Impressions of the ExTFP

It is clearly evident from the results that have been reported in this section that the sources' evaluations of the ExTFP varied directly with their involvement in the program. Program directors, who probably had the most at stake in the enterprise, were thoroughly enthusiastic, not to say Pollyannaish, in their ratings. Regular faculty members and fellows, who were somewhat less personally involved than the directors, made judgments that were a little less enthusiastic than those of the directors. Evaluation teams, who spent only two days viewing the programs and who maintained calculated objectivity as their ideal, were able to temper their enthusiasm with criticism.

Yet it is the burden of this report that all four sources, including the evaluators, produced predominantly favorable judgments of the program. Furthermore, the responses of those who were involved in the program are not to be discredited simply because of their involvement. In all but a very few institutions, it appears, a group of highly qualified teachers were brought together with a group of intelligent, hard working, experienced, thoroughly committed students. When circumstances also promoted the development of strong group solidarity and high morale among the fellows, a truly impressive educational experience probably occurred. Even when the social context was less than ideal, the juxtaposition of a first-rate student body and a better-than-competent faculty doubtless produced educational effects that were considerably above the average.

V. Correlates of Effectiveness and Satisfaction

We have seen that satisfaction with the ExTFP and judgments of its effectiveness were both very positive. Nevertheless, there were consistent differences from one program to another in the extent of satisfaction of the various respondents and in the ratings of effectiveness that they gave. Our purpose in this section is to examine the relationship of other variables to judgments of effectiveness and satisfaction.

Two sources of evidence -- one qualitative, the other quantitative -- are used in this analysis. The qualitative material consists of comments by evaluation teams about the influence that program directors had upon the effectiveness of the ExTFP. This chapter begins with a discussion of these comments. The quantitative material is made up of correlations among responses to the various questionnaires; the analysis of this material constitutes the bulk of the chapter. A detailed summary is presented at the end of the chapter; readers who are unfamiliar with correlational materials may find it helpful to read this summary before examining the correlation tables in detail.

A. The Role of the Director in Program Effectiveness

Analysis of the role of the program's director in the operation of the ExTFP was not systematically built into the questionnaires and the evaluator's ratings. Nevertheless, reports from evaluation teams made it clear that the actions of the director were frequently crucial to the success or lack of success of individual programs. Once this became clear, the written comments of the evaluation teams were examined in detail to make whatever inferences were possible about this topic. Analysis of these comments may be summarized as follows:[1]

It is apparent from the reports of evaluation teams that the quality of directors had a major impact on the conduct of programs. In general, when the evaluators commented on the ability, dedication, enthusiasm, availability, and seriousness of directors, they also rated the programs as effective and productive. When comments were made about the director's lack of status in the institution, when the directorship changed between the time of application and the time the program began, when tension ruled between the director and his staff, the program was characterized as weak, poorly planned, poorly integrated, and unproductive.

Because there was no provision in the guidelines stipulating that the director be given released time for his administrative duties, many directors lacked time to carry out their duties and lacked funds for necessary supporting work. In some cases, the director functioned as a coordinator rather than an administrator, with neither the

---

[1]Professor William Engbretson carried out this analysis and drafted the summarizing statement.

power nor the funds to conduct the program as it had been represented in the proposal. In sum, programs seemed to be most effective when the director was deeply involved in the program's goals and was able both to devote sufficient time to administrative duties and to foster cooperation and respect from participants and faculty.

The frequency and urgency of these comments suggests that special consideration should be given to this key role in future studies of the ExTFP and in the organization of individual programs.

B. Some Comments on Correlational Methods

1. The Nature of the Data

To determine the relationships among variables, for every institution the arithmetic mean was computed for the judgments made by each source on the items that were of interest. This permitted institutions to be arrayed, for example, according to the average degree of satisfaction that the fellows expressed, according to the average faculty rating of effectiveness, and so on for a substantial number of variables. Product-moment correlation coefficients were then computed among these variables.

It should be obvious that two variables cannot be correlated with one another unless there is at least some variation in the scores on each from one observation to another. If all of the scores on one item fall at the identical point, then responses to that item cannot possibly co-vary with responses to some other item. On many of the items that dealt with satisfaction and effectiveness the responses of directors showed next to no variation, being largely concentrated at the most favorable alternatives. For this reason, directors' responses will not be included in the correlation matrices that are presented in this section.

There remained responses by faculty and fellows at 47 institutions, and responses by faculty, fellows, and evaluators at 31 institutions which were visited. It seemed clear that our interpretation of the results would be substantially strengthened by including a discussion of the correlations of evaluators' judgments with those made by fellows and faculty members. However, correlations based only on the 31 programs that were visited might, because they ignored 16 other institutions, give a distorted picture of the true pattern of relationships among variables. To make sure that this was not the case, two correlation matrices were computed, one based on responses by faculty and fellows in all 47 institutions, the other based on responses by faculty, fellows, and evaluators in the 31 schools that were visited. A comparison of the correlations between identical pairs of variables in the two matrices showed that very similar results were obtained. Therefore, only correlation coefficients based on the 31 programs that were visited will be used in the results that are reported below. With a set of 31 observations, a correlation of about .35 is required for the inference that it differs from zero by an amount greater than would be expected by chance.

2. Interpreting the Correlation Coefficients

When two variables show a sizeable correlation, it is often tempting and sometimes reasonable to conclude that they are somehow causally related. This temptation should be indulged with caution, if at all; causal relationships cannot be established by correlational techniques. For example, we shall see that there was a high positive correlation between fellows' morale and their judgments of program effectiveness: in programs where morale was high, fellows' judgments of effectiveness was high, when morale was low so were fellows' judgments of effectiveness. Clearly, however, this does not mean that high morale produces an effective program. It is equally likely that the causal chain goes the other way, that morale goes down when a program becomes ineffective or up as effectiveness improves. It is also plausible that the two variables interact, so that some degree of ineffectiveness depresses morale, which makes for even less effectiveness, decreasing morale still further. The point is that one should be cautious in interpreting correlations. The results that will be reported below often seem to point toward ways by which programs can be improved; we believe, in fact, that they offer suggestions for improvement. But these suggestions must be examined intelligently, not accepted uncritically as a consequence of an impressively large correlation coefficient.

A final point must be made. It has long been known that when judgments are made on several variables, all of which have a desirable and an undesirable pole, a built-in correlation is introduced. A respondent who takes a favorable or unfavorable stance with respect to some issue is likely to rate all of the subsidiary aspects of that issue in a manner consistent with his over-all position. In particular, people who are favorable to the ExTFP as a whole would probably be partial to all its parts. We have already seen evidence of such a tendency in the responses of the program directors. So a certain degree of correlation must be expected between any pair of items from the same questionnaire as a simple function of this bias. However, such a bias cannot be invoked as an explanation when items from different questionnaires correlate with one another; when two different sources agree in their ratings of an institution on some dimensions, the bias of either source alone cannot be invoked as an explanation. For this reason, special attention must be given to the correlations between judgments that were made by different sources.

C. Correlations Among Measures of Effectiveness and Satisfaction

It has already become evident that faculty members, fellows, and evaluators all showed favorable opinions of the effectiveness of the ExTFP. The question at hand is whether an institution that was ranked high on one measure also received a high ranking on another. For purposes of this presentation, measures of satisfaction and effectiveness will be combined in one correlation matrix owing to the fact, as we shall see, that the two kinds of measures had very high correlations with one another.

Table 10 presents the pattern of correlations among eight measures of effectiveness and satisfaction. It is apparent that there were consistently high positive correlations among such ratings when they were given by the same source. Thus, the average correlation among the faculty items was +.55 and the average correlation among the three fellow items was +.72. High correlations were also obtained between judgments by the fellows and those by evaluators, the average correlation being +.55. As to correlations between faculty judgments and those by the other two sources, however, only faculty ratings of whether the program met the fellows' educational needs correlated with all of the items from the other sources. In addition, faculty judgments of whether the fellows would become better teachers correlated with fellows' judgments of effectiveness and satisfaction but not with evaluators' judgments. Faculty members' own reactions to the program and their ratings of its value to the fellows did not correlate significantly with any of the ratings of satisfaction and effectiveness that fellows or evaluators made.

Table 10. Correlations among Measures of Effectiveness and Satisfaction

Source	Item	Faculty 16	18	20a	26	Fellows 23	24	31	Ev. 19
Faculty	16. Reaction to ExTFP	--	.43	.63	.69	.26	.31	.34	.24
	18. Did fellows become better teacher?	.43	--	.43	.62	.43	.46	.55	.14
	20a. ExTFP valuable for fellows?	.63	.43	--	.49	.02	.01	.17	.12
	26. ExTFP meet fellows' needs?	.69	.62	.49	--	.41	.58	.61	.44
Fellows	23. ExTFP meet your major need?	.26	.43	.02	.41	--	.61	.74	.40
	24. Reaction to ExTFP	.31	.46	.01	.58	.61	--	.81	.60
	31. ExTFP help your teaching?	.34	.55	.17	.61	.74	.81	--	.65
Evaluator	19. ExTFP meet fellows' needs?	.24	.14	.12	.44	.40	.60	.65	--

The fact that the fellows' judgments of effectiveness correlated with those by the evaluators and also with faculty members' estimates of whether the ExTFP met the fellows' educational needs is encouraging evidence of consistent, reliably-ascertained differences between programs in their effectiveness. Why the other faculty measures of satisfaction and effectiveness did not also correlate with the items from the fellows' and the evaluator questionnaires is not immediately clear.

D. The Relationship Between Program Effectiveness and Program Structure

Under this heading we will consider the correlations between program effectiveness and three classes of variables: (1) achievement of the en bloc approach, solidarity, and morale, (2) relations among departments and institutions, and (3) the role of the director. In each case, we first present the correlation among variables within the set, then their correlations with effectiveness.

1. The En-Bloc Approach, Solidarity, and Morale

a. Correlation among measures. We have already learned (a) that a generally high level of solidarity was achieved in all of the programs but (b) some institutions had a consistently higher level of morale than did others. Table 11 presents the correlations among the different ratings of solidarity and morale. All but one of the 10 correlation coefficients achieved statistical significance, the mean correlation being .58. There was, then, remarkable agreement between sources as to which programs were characterized by a very high degree of solidarity and morale and which were not. It should be noted that the lowest correlation in this table, .30, was between the evaluators' rating of successful achievement of the en bloc approach and the faculty rating of student morale.

Table 11. Correlations among Measures of Solidarity and Morale

Source	Item	Faculty 48	Faculty 49	Fellows 47	Fellows 49	Ev. 17
Faculty	48. Student solidarity	--	.71	.57	.68	.45
	49. Student morale	.71	--	.57	.67	.30
Fellows	47. Student solidarity	.57	.57	--	.76	.49
	49. Own morale	.68	.67	.76	--	.56
Evaluator	17. En bloc successful	.45	.30	.49	.56	--

b. Relation of solidarity and morale to satisfaction and effectiveness. Table 12 presents the correlations between measures of solidarity and morale and those of satisfaction and effectiveness. It is evident that the majority of these correlations were quite high, even when the ratings were obtained from different sources, except that fellow and evaluator ratings of solidarity did not correlate significantly with faculty measures of effectiveness. The average correlation of faculty ratings of solidarity with faculty

ratings of effectiveness was +.50, with fellows' ratings of effectiveness, +.46, and with the evaluator rating of effectiveness, +.47. The average correlation of fellows' ratings of solidarity with their own ratings of effectiveness was +.47, with the evaluator rating of effectiveness, +.42, and with faculty ratings of effectiveness, +.28. Finally, the evaluator rating of achievement of the en bloc approach correlated +.71 with the evaluator measure of effectiveness, had an average correlation of +.41 with fellows' measures of effectiveness, and an average correlation of only +.18 with faculty ratings of effectiveness. Whatever the causal factors that may be involved in these correlations, it is clear that the achievement of the en bloc approach and of solidarity and morale was associated with program effectiveness, especially as viewed by fellows and evaluators.

Table 12. Correlations of Solidarity and Morale with Program Effectiveness

Source	Item	Faculty 16	18	20a	26	Fellows 23	24	31	Ev. 19
Faculty	48. Student solidarity	.43	.42	.25	.44	.35	.60	.58	.57
	49. Student morale	.62	.62	.62	.63	.22	.47	.51	.37
Fellows	47. Student solidarity	.27	.37	.22	.32	.53	.64	.55	.44
	49. Own morale	.30	.25	.22	.30	.13	.57	.41	.40
Evaluator	17. En bloc successful	.28	.08	.13	.21	.29	.51	.44	.71

2. Relations among Departments and Institutions.

a. Correlations among measures. Under this heading will be considered evaluator and fellow ratings of cooperation between departments, and evaluator judgments of whether the institution had established relationships with the local school systems. It will be remembered that respondents reported great variability among programs in the extent of cooperation between subject-matter and teacher-education departments, and in the amount of cooperation with local school systems. Table 13 presents the correlations among the three measures of cooperation. None of these correlations is higher than +.21. This independence of one set of responses from another reveals, first, that according to evaluators' reports, whether subject-matter and teacher-education departments cooperated had no bearing upon whether cooperation was established between the institution and local school systems. Second, the low correlation means that

judgments of departmental cooperation made by fellows were either based upon different criteria from those used by evaluators or that the two groups used their criteria differently in these judgments.

Table 13. Correlations among Measures of Departmental and Institutional Cooperation

Source	Item	Fellows 38	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4
Fellows	38. Departments cooperate	--	.15	.21
Evaluator	3. Departments cooperate	.15	--	.18
	4. Coop. with local schools	.21	.18	--

b. Correlations of measures of cooperation with program effectiveness.

Despite the lack of correlation among these measures of cooperation, we see in Table 14 that both fellows' and evaluators' assessments of departmental cooperation were correlated significantly with ratings of effectiveness made by fellows and evaluators; however, they were consistently uncorrelated with faculty ratings of program effectiveness. Thus, although the fellows may have used different criteria from evaluators in judging departmental cooperation, by either criterion, programs that were rated as having a relatively high degree of cooperation among departments were more likely than not to be adjudged effective. The degree of cooperation with local school systems, as reported by evaluators, was substantially unrelated to any measures of effectiveness.

Table 14. Correlations of Departmental Cooperation with Program Effectiveness

Source	Item	Faculty 16	18	20a	26	Fellows 23	24	31	Ev. 19
Fellows	38. Departments cooperate	.12	.21	-.11	.35	.56	.70	.60	.54
Evaluator	3. Departments cooperate	-.04	-.20	-.12	.06	.40	.32	.47	.44
	4. Coop. with local schools	-.10	-.10	-.11	.27	.14	.26	.31	.35

E. The Relationship Between Program Effectiveness and Program Strategy

The reader will recall that the general topic of program strategy subsumed ratings of the utilization of fellows' background, the amount of competitiveness and the work load, the involvement of the faculty, and the extent of innovation in the programs. The correlation of each of these variables with effectiveness will be discussed in turn.

1. Utilization of Fellows' Background

a. Correlation among measures. In their judgments of whether the program's organization took into account the extensive experience of fellows, evaluation teams were distinct from the other three groups in saying that the majority did not. Though they disagreed with the fellows in the extent to which they felt that fellows' backgrounds were utilized, the evaluation teams clearly arrayed institutions on this variable in about the same order as did the fellows, for the correlation between ratings from these two sources was +.45. This correlation, in fact, was the largest correlation in the matrix (Table 15); the only other significant correlation is that between fellows' judgments on this variable and faculty statements that the program was modified to take advantage of fellows' experience.

Table 15. Correlations among Measures of Whether the Programs Utilized Fellows' Backgrounds

Source	Item	Faculty 45	Faculty 46	Fellows 42	Ev. 16
Faculty	45. Effort to use experience	--	.06	.05	.22
	46. Modify prog. for experience	.06	--	.38	.07
Fellows	42. Build on experience	.05	.38	--	.45
Evaluator	16. Take acct. of experience	.22	.07	.45	--

b. Correlations of utilization of participants' backgrounds with program effectiveness and solidarity. As is shown in Table 16, faculty judgments of whether the program utilized fellows' experiences were not significantly related to any measure of effectiveness; faculty statements that the program was modified to take advantage of the fellows' experience were generally related to the faculty's own estimates of effectiveness,

but not to those by fellows and by evaluators. On the other hand, evaluators' and fellows' judgments on this same measure were significantly related to every fellow and evaluator measure of effectiveness and also to faculty judgments that the program met the educational needs of the fellows. We may conclude, then, that the programs whose organization built best on the backgrounds of the fellows according to the interpretation of the evaluators and the fellows (and we do not know the criteria on which these sources based their interpretations) were also adjudged to be more effective.

Table 16. Correlations of Utilization of Participants' Backgrounds and Program Effectiveness

Source	Item	Faculty 16	20a	26	18	Fellows 23	24	31	Ev. 19
Faculty	45. Effort to use exp.	-.19	.04	-.13	-.25	-.22	-.06	-.10	.06
	46. Modify prog. for exp.	.54	.31	.53	.27	.12	.21	.23	.05
Fellows	42. Build on experience	.27	.16	.51	.53	.48	.71	.76	.47
Evaluator	16. Take acct. of exp.	.16	.04	.44	.03	.34	.60	.60	.71

2. Competitiveness and Work Load

a. Correlations among measures. The correlations reported in Table 17 lend empirical support to our earlier conclusion that the faculty judgments about student work load represented a positive statement about the fellows, not an objective assessment of the amount of work they were required to do: every correlation of the faculty judgments on this item with those of fellows or evaluators was negative. On the other hand, fellows' judgments of their work load correlated positively and significantly with those of the evaluators. It should be noted, in addition, that neither of these last two measures -- fellows' and evaluators' estimates of the work load -- correlated significantly with fellows' statements about the level of competitiveness in their programs; clearly, fellows could believe they were overworked in either a competitive or a non-competitive atmosphere.

Table 17. Correlations among Measures of Competitiveness and Work Load

Source	Item	Faculty 35	Fellows 26	Fellows 29	Ev. 14
Faculty	35. Did students work hard	--	-.39	-.31	-.26
Fellows	26. Work Load	-.39	--	.28	.54
	29. Level of competition	-.31	.28	--	.01
Evaluator	14. Work Load	-.26	.54	.01	--

b. Relationship of competitiveness and work load to program effectiveness. Further evidence for our conclusion that faculty ratings of the amount of work the fellows did actually represent favorable judgments of their performance is given in row 1 of Table 18. This measure correlated positively and significantly with every faculty rating of program effectiveness and with two of the three effectiveness ratings made by fellows.

A different pattern held for fellows' ratings of their work load. These judgments showed a high negative correlation with fellows' opinions that the program was stimulating and interesting, and moderate negative correlations with the other ratings of program effectiveness by the fellows and evaluators as well as with faculty judgments of whether the program produced better teachers. Evaluator ratings of work load also showed negative correlations with fellow and evaluator ratings of effectiveness. As to the level of competitiveness in the program, while the correlations of this measure with judgments of effectiveness and satisfaction were consistently negative, they barely achieved statistical significance in only two cases. In short, programs in which fellows and evaluators reported that the work load was excessive tended also to be programs which received low marks for effectiveness and satisfaction, but a program that was viewed as competitive was not necessarily ineffective.

Table 18. Correlations of Competitiveness and Work Load with Program Effectiveness

Source	Item	Faculty 16	Faculty 20a	Faculty 26	Faculty 18	Fellows 23	Fellows 24	Fellows 31	Ev. 19
Faculty	35. Work hard?	.49	.41	.63	.62	.22	.51	.46	.24
Fellows	26. Fellows' work load	-.34	.03	-.21	-.43	-.35	-.72	-.30	-.32
	29. Competitiveness	-.17	-.28	-.24	-.39	.01	-.39	-.30	.04
Evaluator	14. Fellows' work load	-.26	.08	-.30	-.26	-.24	-.44	-.35	-.38

3. Involvement of the Faculty

a. Correlations among measures. There were five items that bore on the faculty's involvement in the ExTFP: two of these asked the faculty whether the ExTFP had been challenging and satisfying, one asked evaluators if the faculty had been challenged and stimulated by the ExTFP, and two asked fellows whether the faculty had been accessible and helpful. The correlations among these measures, presented in Table 19 show that almost the only significant correlations are between measures from the same questionnaire. Thus, institutes in which the faculty said they were challenged were also those in which the faculty found the teaching satisfying; schools in which fellows reported the faculty were accessible were schools in which fellows said the faculty were helpful. The only siginificant correlation between items from different questionnaires was between fellows' reports of faculty helpfulness and evaluator ratings of faculty stimulation.

Table 19. Correlations among Measures of Faculty Involvement

Source	Item	Faculty 24	Faculty 25	Fellows 41a	Fellows 41b	Ev. 9a
Faculty	24. Was teaching challenging?	--	.56	.19	.30	.33
	25. Was teaching satisfying?	.56	--	.10	.28	.14
Fellows	41a. Were faculty accessible?	.19	.10	--	.87	.24
	41b. Were faculty helpful?	.30	.28	.87	--	.41
Evaluator	9a. Was staff challenged?	.33	.14	.24	.41	--

b. Correlations between faculty involvement and effectiveness. The pattern of correlations between faculty involvement and effectiveness, presented in Table 20, is not easy to understand. One of the faculty measures, statements about whether the teaching experience was satisfying, correlated with virtually every measure of effectiveness and satisfaction -- perhaps because it might, itself, be called a measure of satisfaction. Evaluators' judgments of whether the faculty was challenged were correlated with fellow and evaluator, but not faculty, measures of effectiveness. Fellow ratings of the faculty's helpfulness and accessibility correlated significantly only with their own judgments of effectiveness.

Table 20. Correlations of Faculty Involvement with Program Effectiveness

Source	Item	Measures of Program Effectiveness							
		Faculty				Fellows			Ev.
		16	20a	26	18	23	24	31	19
Faculty	24. Teaching chall.	.42	.09	.31	.28	.26	.25	.26	.18
	25. Teaching satisf.	.75	.27	.55	.46	.31	.45	.50	.30
Fellows	41a. Fac. accessible	-.01	-.25	-.01	.23	.58	.40	.29	.15
	41b. Fac. helpful	.14	-.11	.23	.38	.65	.66	.49	.32
Evaluator	9a. Fac. challenged	.16	.01	.24	.08	.44	.51	.45	.68

4. Innovativeness

As we have seen, on the two measures of innovativeness, neither faculty members nor evaluators reported any appreciable degree of innovation. Nor did measures of innovation from the two sources vary jointly: the correlation between them was .10.

On the other hand, as may be seen in Table 21, the faculty estimate of innovativeness was related to every measure of program effectiveness; the average correlation of this variable with faculty ratings of effectiveness was .55, with fellow ratings of effectiveness, .48, and with the evaluator rating of effectiveness, .38 (Table 21). Evaluator ratings of innovativeness, on the other hand, were significantly related only to the evaluator measure of effectiveness and to faculty judgments of whether the fellows became better teachers as a result of their experience. We see, then, that by the evaluators' standards of innovation, our earlier generalization holds up: programs could be effective whether they were extensively innovative or substantially traditional. It should be noted that this question asked faculty members whether they had observed innovative teaching methods or practices; in view of this wording, their judgments may have reflected inventiveness in some one teacher's performance rather than innovativeness in the over-all program. If so, the meaning of this variable's correlations with effectiveness is considerably different from the meaning that would be carried by a correlation with innovativeness in the program itself.

An alternative explanation of the correlation between these faculty ratings and effectiveness is that the current popular emphasis on innovation in education has served to make "quality" and "innovation" in some respects synonomous for many people. Thus many faculty members may have felt that if they judged their program to be successful, it must have been innovative, as well.

Table 21. Correlations of Innovativeness with Program Effectiveness

Source	Item	Measures of Effectiveness: Faculty 16	20a	26	18	Fellows 23	24	31	Ev. 19
Faculty	27. Innovativeness	.59	.41	.79	.48	.50	.42	.53	.38
Evaluator	2. Innovativeness	.11	.18	.01	.46	-.14	.03	--	.44

5. Effects on institutional development

a. Correlations among measures. We have seen above that the three sources differed remarkably in their estimates of the Program's effect on institutional development. As might be expected, the pattern of correlations between variables showed the same lack of correspondence (Table 22): estimates by faculty members of the Program's value to the institution were uncorrelated with evaluators' ratings of both effects on teacher training and effects on departmental development. At the same time, the high correlation between the two evaluators' judgments shows that institutions at which evaluators felt changes were made in methods of teacher education also were judged to be institutions where departmental development was affected. This relationship, actually is partly determined by the fact that the "department" whose development was being affected; that is, the home department of the program, was in half the cases the department of education.

Table 22. Correlations among Measures of Effects on Institutional Development

Source	Item	Faculty 20c	Evaluator 1	8
Faculty	20c. Value to institution	--	.16	.07
Evaluator	1. Effects on teacher training	.16	--	.56
	8. Effects on department development	.07	.56	--

b. Correlations between institutional development and effectiveness. Table 23 presents the correlations between measures of institutional development and judgments of satisfaction and effectiveness. Global judgments by faculty members of the Program's value to the institution correlated positively with their own ratings of satisfaction and of

program effectiveness, but were only minimally related to such ratings by other sources. Evaluator judgments of the Program's effects upon the host institution showed low positive relationships to their own and fellows' ratings of effectiveness, but were unrelated to such ratings by faculty members. In short, it appears that a program could be effective in training students without, necessarily, serving as the impetus for extensive changes in the pattern or organization at the host institution.

Table 23. Correlations of Effects on Institutional Development with Program Effectiveness

Source	Item	Measures of Program Effectiveness							
		Faculty				Fellows			Ev.
		16	20a	26	18	23	24	31	19
Faculty	20c. Value to insti.	.70	.47	.47	.63	.07	.41	.35	.29
Evaluator	1. Effects on teacher tr.	.04	.10	.10	.20	.29	.44	.37	.35
	8. Effects on dept. div.	.14	.03	.07	.22	.14	.27	.31	.35

E. Summary: Correlates of Effectiveness

Detailed comments should be made about two aspects of these results. The first has to do with the reliability of judgments, with whether two judgments which seem, on the surface, to be asking the same question do, in fact, correlate with one another; the second is the consistent correlates of satisfaction and effectiveness.

1. The reliability of the judgments

In general, when a single source was asked more than one question on the same topic or logically related ones, the responses to those questions were positively correlated. Thus, faculty, fellow, or evaluator responses to one item showed generally high correlations with responses by the same source to other items whose content was similar. For example, institutions whose faculty members said the Program was stimulating and interesting throughout were also the ones whose faculty said that the Program was of great value to the fellows, that it helped the fellows become better teachers, and that it met fellows' educational needs.

However, responses by different sources to items that were similar in content did not always correlate significantly. Two sets of items -- satisfaction and effectiveness, and solidarity and morale -- showed marked consistency across all three sources; for each set of items, the ratings that institutions received from faculty members paralleled those given by fellows and also, to a lesser extent, those given by evaluation teams. On a number of other factors, responses by faculty members were substantially uncorrelated with those of

fellows and of evaluators. However, the responses of fellows and those of evaluation teams correlated virtually across the board -- in ratings of satisfaction and effectiveness, of solidarity and morale, of fellows' work load, of whether the fellows' experience was utilized, and of the extent of faculty involvement in the Program, responses from these two sources correlated significantly; only in judgments of whether there was cooperation between different departments were fellows' judgments and those by evaluators uncorrelated. For one set of items -- estimates of fellows' work load -- faculty judgments were inversely related to those from the other two sources, probably because the question that was asked of faculty members evoked judgments of the level of fellows' motivation instead of objective assessments of their work load. In short, there was consistently high agreement between judgments by fellows and those by evaluation teams; agreement between these two sources and the faculty was largely restricted to two areas: (a) satisfaction and effectiveness and (b) solidarity and morale.

It is interesting to speculate about the meaning of this differential pattern of correlations. Since the three sources viewed the program from different perspectives, the pattern of correlations probably reflects such differences. It might be argued, first of all, that whether a program was very effective or relatively ineffective, and whether its fellows had very high or relatively low morale could be determined by faculty and fellows alike from evidence that is public and common. People discuss with one another how much they have learned and how well it was presented; there are indicators of group solidarity and morale which almost any adult can see and identify. On the other hand, more subjective criteria are called into play for judging whether and how much the fellows' prior experience was utilized by the program, or how deeply the faculty was involved in the program. Such questions are probably less frequently discussed, the bases for decision about them less commonly shared, than the topics of effectiveness or group solidarity. If this is true, judgments on these latter topics would be more likely to reflect the biasing effect of the judge's social position. To be more specific, it seems likely that the faculty's institutional position made it unlikely that they would learn much about the fellows' past experience and its relevance to the course material, or about fellows' judgments of whether the faculty was involved in the program. In the absence of explicit information, the faculty was doubtless likely to respond in a manner consistent with their desire that their own program be rated effective and "good."

These considerations would account for the lack of correlation between responses of fellows and faculty on issues of this second type, but not necessarily for the fact that judgments of evaluators paralleled those of the fellows instead of the faculty when the latter sources disagreed. Perhaps their discussions with the fellows exposed evaluation teams to information that was not available to the faculty; alternatively, perhaps evaluators considered the faculty to be more personally involved than fellows in the outcome of the evaluation, hence more likely to be biased in their judgments.

Whether one of these explanations or some other one can account for the results, of course, requires information that is not available in the present study. Concerning the reliability of judgments, we have seen that judgments made by a single source on a single issue were quite reliable, that consistent positive correlations were found between the three different sources in their judgments of effectiveness and of morale, and that evaluation teams and fellows consistently agreed with each other, but not with the faculty, on other issues.

2. Correlates of satisfaction and effectiveness

Programs that ranked high on satisfaction and rated effectiveness (a) were adjudged by faculty and by fellows to have a high degree of solidarity and morale, and by evaluation teams to have been successful in achieving esprit de corps through the en bloc approach; (b) were successful in the view of fellows and of evaluators in utilizing the previous experience of the fellows; and (c) were adjudged by fellows and evaluators not to have required an altogether unrealistic amount of work.

The fact that effectiveness and morale went together is not surprising; it reaffirms a long standing common-sense generalization. It is interesting to note, however, that effectiveness was correlated only with judgments by fellows and evaluators of whether the fellows' backgrounds were utilized and of work load; judgments by faculty members on the last two issues did not correlate with the same judgments by the other two sources. This suggests that the faculty and directors may often have been uninformed of the fellows' attitudes on these and other issues; indeed, spontaneous comments by evaluation teams suggested that such was often the case. This, in turn, has implications for the conduct of programs in institutions where the fellows thought that their work load was much too heavy, or that they were too seldom able to contribute from their own knowledge and experience to the educational program, and where the faculty and director were unaware of these attitudes. It seems likely that information about fellows' attitudes might have induced the staff of the programs either to change some part of their educational structure and content so as to meet the fellows' objections, or to clarify for fellows and staff alike the reasons for retaining an existing system. These actions, in turn, would likely have made such programs more enjoyable and effective. The obvious suggestion, then, is that some programs might have been much more effective if the fellows' views on sensitive issues had been more effectively communicated to the faculty and the director. Clearly, the primary responsibility for ensuring that such communication takes place rests with the director and his staff, not with the fellows.

Although fellows and evaluators did not agree as to which programs had a great deal of cooperation among departments and which did not, by either the evaluators' or the fellows' criterion, programs with such cooperation were more effective than those without it. Similarly, although faculty members and evaluators did not agree as to which host institutions benefitted most from the Program, those institutions that either group judged to have benefitted most were rated as most effective. Two other kinds of questions showed inconsistent patterns of relationships with satisfaction and effectiveness. Ratings by each source of the extent of faculty involvement in the program were correlated with effectiveness as rated by that source but not as rated by the other sources.

Finally, there was a significant correlation between faculty ratings of innovativeness and every measure of effectiveness -- institutions whose faculties were impressed with the innovations that had been introduced through the Program were considered to be relatively effective by faculty, fellows, and evaluators alike; however, evaluator ratings of innovativeness were only marginally correlated with effectiveness as judged by evaluators and were uncorrelated with such judgments by the other two sources. We have suggested that faculty ratings of innovativeness may have reflected their own involvement in the program more than objective judgments of this phenomenon.

We have already remarked that one should not infer causation from correlation. Hopefully, future studies in this series will help further to clarify the factors that account for differences among institutions. Our caveat against confusing correlation with causation, however, does not apply to the relationship between the director's behavior and program effectiveness. The experience of the evaluation teams strongly suggested that an energetic, persuasive director with institutional power commensurate to his responsibilities could play a major role in assuring the effectiveness of the program. Conversely, a promising program was sometimes rendered less effective by an inept director, one with insufficient time to give to his duties, or one denied the power to institute and carry through both general policies and the specific procedures necessary to implement those policies.